

Applicant	:	Min ZHU et al.
Appl. No.	:	09/751,595
Examiner	:	Uzma Alam
Docket No.	:	16440.4004

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 have been amended and new claims 28 and 29 have been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in paragraph [0035] on page 10. Support for new claim 28 can be found, for example, in paragraph [0038] on page 11. Support for new claim 29 can be found, for example, in paragraph [0065] on pages 20-21.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Butler (U.S. 6,584,493) in view of Tang et al. (U.S. 6,349,327). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 are patentable over Butler and Tang because neither Butler nor Tang, taken alone or in combination, discloses, suggests or teaches “monitoring said respective management processes with a single supervisor process to determine whether a quality of service is met; and when the quality of service is not met, spawning a new logical process, wherein the new logical process comprises a new collaboration server or a new application server” as required by each of these claims.

Butler does not teach or suggest “when the quality of service is not met, spawning a new logical process, wherein the new logical process is a new collaboration server or a new application server.” While Butler discloses dynamically allocating memory to each member of a conference, Butler does not disclose, teach or suggest spawning, i.e., creating, a new collaboration server or a new application server based on a determination that a quality of service is not being met. Adjusting the allocation of memory does not teach or suggest spawning, i.e., creating, a new collaboration server or a new application server, which provides additional services for the online conference.

An advantage of the claimed invention is that it enables a collaborative computing system to add additional participants to a conference while maintaining a quality of service by spawning, i.e., creating, a new collaboration server or a new application server when the quality of service is not being met. In contrast, Butler handles additional participants by adjusting the allocation of memory, which does not provide a new collaboration server or a new application server.

Applicant	:	Min ZHU et al.
Appl. No.	:	09/751,595
Examiner	:	Uzma Alam
Docket No.	:	16440.4004

For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that claims 1, 7, 13, and 19 are patentable, and respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18, and 20-24 depend from claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, respectively, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above.

Claim 25 depends from claim 1, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 1. Claim 25 is additionally patentable because neither Butler nor Tang, either alone or in combination, discloses, suggests or teaches spawning, i.e., creating, the plurality of logical processes with a process manager.

Claim 26 depends from claim 25, and is therefore patentable for at least the reasons given for claim 25. Claim 26 is additionally because neither Butler nor Tang, either alone or in combination, discloses, suggests or teaches sending a request to the process manager to spawn, i.e., create, the new logical process when the quality of service is not met.

New claims

New claims 28 and 29 depend from claim 1, and are therefore patentable for at least the reasons given above.

New claim 28 is additionally patentable because neither Butler nor Tang, either alone or in combination, discloses, suggests or teaches “spawning a new management process; and associating the new management process with the new collaboration server or new application server, wherein the new management process is configured so that the new collaboration server or new application server is capable of communicating with every other said logical process.”

New claim 29 is additionally patentable because neither Butler nor Tang, either alone or in combination, discloses, suggests or teaches “wherein the new collaboration server or new application server receives configuration, operating parameters, and current meeting data from the supervisor process.”

Applicant : Min ZHU et al.
Appl. No. : 09/751,595
Examiner : Uzma Alam
Docket No. : 16440.4004

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney at 949-567-6700 at his convenience.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee which may be required in connection with this Amendment to deposit account No. 15-0665.

Respectfully submitted,

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

Dated: September 6, 2006

By: Eugene Worley
Eugene Worley
Reg. No. 47,186

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, CA 92614-2558
Tel. 949-567-6700
Fax: 949-567-6710